



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/375,710	08/17/1999	BRIAN M. UNITT	476-1830	5479

7590 01/21/2004

WILLIAM M LEE JR  
LEE MANN SMITH MCWILLIAMS  
SWEENEY & OHLSON  
PO BOX 2786  
CHICAGO, IL 606902786

EXAMINER
----------

WAXMAN, ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2667

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/375,710

Applicant(s)

UNITT ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew M Waxman

Art Unit

2667

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

CP

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_


Claim(s) rejected: 1-9 and 15-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented in the response filed 6 January 2004, are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 15, 16, and 21, Applicant argues that the prior art of reference does not teach or fairly suggest: I) transporting traffic over a low, bandwidth communication path such as a subscriber loop; II) at a subscriber location, separately converting voice and data traffic to respective IP packet streams; III) at a subscriber location, separately segmenting voice and data IP packet streams to respective ATM cell streams; and IV) at the subscriber location multiplexing the ATM stream for transmission on the low bandwidth path. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees, and contends that the prior art of record does disclose the limitations as recited above. Bruckheimer discloses an apparatus (FIG. 1) which separately converts voice and data traffic to respective IP packet streams, separately segments voice and data IP packet streams to respective ATM cell streams, and multiplexes the ATM stream for transmission (shown in previous OA, paper #6). Therefore, the apparatus as described is essentially a "subscriber" location, as described by the claim language. Furthermore, the motivation recited by Examiner for combining Bruckheimer with DeNap, that Applicant was "unable to comprehend," is, in more precise terms, to provide a "full service ATM network" serving specific markets in a simple cost effective manner. See DeNap 1 : 48 - 1 : 62.

  
CHI PHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 11/15/08